UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718.218	11/20/2003	Richard D. Dettinger	ROC920030251US1	9017

46797   7590   03/20/2007
IBM CORPORATION, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
DEPT 917, BLDG. 006-1
3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH
ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER
PHAM, KHANH B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2166	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/20/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/718,218	DETTINGER ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Khanh B. Pham	2166

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 January 2007</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1 and 3-41</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1 and 3-41</u> is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) <u>1 and 18</u> is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   The amendment filed 1/3/2007 has been entered. Claims 1, 5-6, 9, 13, 17, 20,

24, 25, 28, 36, and 39-41 have been amended. Claim 2 has been canceled. Claims 1,

3-41 are pending in this Office Action.

Claim Objections

2.   Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: line 8, "accordance

with **the a** view" should be changed to "accordance with a view". Appropriate

correction is required.

Claim 18 is objected to because of the following informality: lines 2-3, "in which

the initially written" should be changed to "in which the abstract query initially written"

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
> matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
> conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 20-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is

directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The claims fail to place the invention squarely within one statutory class of invention.

On page 7, [0029] of the instant specification, applicant has provided evidence that

applicant intends the "medium" to include signals such as "wireless communication". As

such, the claim is drawn to a form of energy. Energy is not one of the four categories of

invention and therefore this claim(s) is/are not statutory. Energy is not a series of steps

or acts and thus is not a process. Energy is not a physical article or object and as such

is not a machine or manufacture. Energy is not a combination of substances and

therefor not a composition of matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
> another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
> granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
> applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
> 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
> only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
> of such treaty in the English language.

5.   Claims 1, 2-4, 6-8, 10-19, 20-23, 25-27 and 29-41 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kawakura et al. (US 2004/0034521 A1),

hereinafter "**Kawakura**".

As per claim 1, Kawakura teaches a method of providing natural language

support for users running queries against a database comprising:

- "providing a data abstract model comprising a plurality of logical fields abstractly

  describing physical data residing in the database" at [0122] and Figs. 7-16;

- "associating the data abstraction model with a language resource component defining a natural language expression for each of the plurality of logical fields" at [0130] - [0133] and Figs. 6-16;

- "creating an effective data abstraction model by modifying the data abstraction model in accordance with a view that reflects one or more security setting for a group of users" at [0179]-[0181] ;

- "displaying to a user of the group of users, the effective data abstraction model" at [0148]-[0149].

As per claim 3, Kawakura teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising: "creating the language resource component for the data abstraction model, the creating comprising mapping a default value to each logical field of the plurality of logical fields" at [0130]-[0133] and Figs. 7-16.

As per claim 4, Kawakura teaches the method of claim 1, wherein "the associating comprises: generating, in the data abstraction model, a reference to the language resource component to associate the data abstraction model with the language resource component" at Fig. 7.

As per claim 5, teaches the method of claim 4, wherein "the associated language resource component is an XML Localization Interchange File Format resource"

As per claim 6, Kawakura teaches a method of providing natural language support for users running queries against a database comprising:

- "providing a data abstraction model comprising a plurality of logical fields abstractly describing physical data residing in the database" at [0122];

- "providing translation information for the data abstraction model describing translations of each of the plurality of logical fields from a first natural language expression to two or more second natural language expressions" at [0130]-[0133];

- "displaying one of the second natural language expression to a user, wherein which of the two or more second natural language expressions is displayed depends upon which natural language expression files are loaded to define a language resource component associated with the data abstract model" at [0143], [0148]-[0149].

As per claim 7, Kawakura teaches the method of claim 6, wherein "the first and second natural language expressions are two different languages" at [0147].

As per claim 8, Kawakura teaches the method of claim 6, wherein "the first and second natural language expressions are two different variations on the same language" at [0183].

As per claim 9, teaches the method of claim 6, wherein "providing translation information comprises providing XML Localization Interchange File Format resource"

As per claim 10, Kawakura teaches the method of claim 6, wherein "the data abstraction model further comprise a reference to at least a portion of the translation information" at [0181].

As per claim 11, Kawakura teaches the method of claim 10, wherein "the referenced portion is a default file" at [0182].

As per claim 12, Kawakura teaches the method of claim 6, wherein "providing translation information comprises successively loading language resource files, wherein each successive language resource file comprises translations of increasing specificity to replace relatively less specific translations of one or more previously loaded language resource files" at [0209]-[0212].

As per claim 13, Kawakura teaches the method of claim 6, wherein "the translation information further describes translations of each of the plurality of logical fields from the first natural language expression to a third natural language expression, and further comprising: displaying, to a user, at least a portion of the data abstraction model, using only one of the first natural language expression, one of the two or more

second natural language expression and the third natural language expression" at

[0147]-[0148] and Figs. 7-13.

As per claim 14, Kawakura teaches the method of claim 13, wherein "which

language expression is used to display the portion of the data abstraction model is

based on user parameters" at [0179].

As per claim 15, Kawakura teaches the method of claim 14, wherein "the user

parameters describe a context of the user" at [0179].

As per claim 16, Kawakura teaches the method of claim 6, further comprising:

- "retrieving an abstract query expressed in the first natural language expression"

  at [0125]-[0126];

- "translating the abstract query on the basis of the translation information to

  express the abstract query in the second natural language expression" at [0129]-

  [0130];

- "displaying the abstract query expressed in the second natural language

  expression" at Figs. 7-16.

As per claim 17, Kawakura teaches a method of providing natural language

support for users running queries against a database comprising:

- "retrieving an abstract query comprising a plurality of logical fields, each

    corresponding to a logical field specification of a data abstraction model

    abstractly describing physical data residing in the database" at Fig. 7;

- "determining from the data abstraction model, an associated language resource

    component" at Fig. 7;

- "determining, from the associated language resource component, at least two

    natural language expressions for the plurality of logical fields of the abstract

    query" at Fig. 8;

- "displaying the abstract query in one of the at least two determined natural

    language expression to a user" at Fig. 9;

- "wherein the natural language expression displayed is determined by a security

    setting of the user" at [0179].

As per claim 18, Kawakura teaches the method of claim 17, further comprising:

"prior to displaying, translating the abstract query from another language expression in

which the abstract query initially written" at [0130]-[0131].

As per claim 19, Kawakura teaches the method of claim 17, wherein "the

associated language resource component is a language resource file, the data

abstraction model including a reference to the language resource file" at Figs. 7-9.

Claims 20-23, 25-27 and 29-41 recite a computer readable medium and computer

system for performing similar method as in claims 1, 2-4, 6-8, 10-19 discussed above

and are therefore rejected by the same reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   **Claims 5, 9, 24, 28** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Kawakura as applied to claims above, and in view of Inanoria (US 2004/0046789

A1), hereinafter "inanoria".

As per claims 5, 9, 24 and 28, Kawakura teaches the same as discussed in the

rejection of claims 4, 6, 23 and 25 above. Kawakura does not explicitly teach the

associated language resource is an "XML Localization Interchange File Format".

However, Inanoria teaches the advantage of XML Localization Interchange File Format

to facilitate "the ease of use and management for multi-lingual characters specially

double-byte characters for Asian languages…" at [0164]Thus, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to

combine Kawakura and Inanoria's teaching in order to "facilitate the ease of use and

management for multi-lingual characters" such as Japanese and Chinese as disclosed

in Kawakura and Inanoria.

Response to Arguments

8.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-41 have been considered but

are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C 101 rejection to claims 20-38, applicant argued that the claimed

invention are directed to article of manufacture (computer readable medium), which is

statutory subject matter. However, on page 7, [0029] of the instant specification,

applicant has provided evidence that applicant intends the "medium" to include signals

such as "wireless communication". As such, the claim is drawn to a form of energy.

Energy is not one of the four categories of invention and therefore this claim(s) is/are

not statutory. Energy is not a series of steps or acts and thus is not a process. Energy

is not a physical article or object and as such is not a machine or manufacture. Energy

is not a combination of substances and therefor not a composition of matter. The 101

rejection to claims 20-39 are therefore maintained.

Conclusion

9.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Khanh B. Pham whose telephone number is (571) 272-

4116. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30am to

4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Khanh B. Pham
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2166

March 14, 2007